

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

Case Number 16-20501

Honorable David M. Lawson

v.

FRANK JAMES LASZLO,

Defendant.

_____ /

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO TERMINATE SUPERVISED RELEASE

The defendant pleaded guilty in the Northern District of Georgia to possession of child pornography and was sentenced on June 29, 2012 to 36 months in custody, to be followed by ten years of supervised release. This Court accepted jurisdiction of the case on July 21, 2016 to monitor the term of supervised release, which began February 3, 2015. Presently, the case is before the Court on the defendant's motion to terminate supervised release, which is scheduled to terminate on February 2, 2025. The government has filed a response but has not taken a position either in favor or opposing the motion. The government notes in its thoughtful response its genuine concerns over the perils of early termination, since the defendant currently lives in a household with a minor child — the twelve-year-old son of his fiancée.

A court may “terminate a term of supervised release and discharge the defendant released at any time after the expiration of one year of supervised release, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure relating to the modification of probation, if it is satisfied that such action is warranted by the conduct of the defendant released and the interest of justice.” 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1).

Laszlo has several things going for him. His supervising probation officer states that

Laszlo has made a “very positive adjustment” while on supervision. He successfully completed sex offender treatment in February 2017 and has remained compliant with all the terms and conditions of supervision. Laszlo has been employed since February 2015, and his probation officer describes his work history as “solid and stable.” He has been allowed to travel out of state for vacation without incident. The probation officer reports that Laszlo’s permitted access to a cell phone and computer has been monitored and no inappropriate use has been reported. He also has remained compliant with the sex offender registration requirements. And he has submitted to polygraph testing with no suggestions of violations detected. Finally, his underlying offense involved no contact with minors.

The policy of the United States Probation Department does not permit a probation officer to recommend early termination of supervised release in sex offender cases. But neither the probation officer nor the assistant United States attorney has voiced any objection to the request. It should be noted, however, that Laszlo must continue to exercise the same care and vigilance in his own behavior that he has shown while under supervision. And he should be mindful that another offense of this nature will expose him to enhanced penalties. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 2252(b)(2).

Based on the information before the Court, it appears that early termination of supervised release is consistent with the interest of justice.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the defendant’s motion for termination of supervised release (ECF No. 3) is **GRANTED**. The defendant is discharged from his term of supervised release.

s/David M. Lawson
DAVID M. LAWSON
United States District Judge

Date: June 24, 2019

PROOF OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing order was served upon each attorney or party of record herein by electronic means or first-class U.S. mail on June 24, 2019.

s/Susan K. Pinkowski
SUSAN K. PINKOWSKI